Hearing 18 – Signs

Questions from the Hearing Panel

Paragraph	Question
11	Request for New Policy - To fill the void in the absence of express direction, is there scope to include the relief Waka Kotahi seeks in Signs Policy 2, to add for instance … *and transport safety*?
11.7	Given that the only difference between the definitions of "Primary production" and "Rural production" is that clause (a) of "Primary production" includes mining and quarrying (not just farm quarries), and therefore encompasses a wider range of activities, would it be better to refer to "Primary production" in SIGN-P1?
12.5	When drafting the heritage chapter did Heritage NZ contribute?
12.5.2	Wouldn't it be more helpful to direct those wishing to put signs on a heritage structure for there to be a specific reference to HH-R3 in the primary signs rule?
13.11.1	What does 'grouped signage' mean?
13.30	If the road reserve is under the authority of Waka Kotahi and they're requesting for no signage overhang in the road reserve of the state highway, then what authority does Council have to reject their request?
13.49	*Waka Kotahi[1] request that requirement SIGN-REQ7 is amended to include standards to improve visibility and safety, including a minimum lettering size for all signs visible from a state highway.* For reasons outlined in 13.49, 13.49.1, 13.49.2 the Section 42A Report author rejects the request. Is there a way to accept Waka Kotahi's submission while at the same time avoiding a burden on minor temporary uses?
General matters	
	DPR-0422.245 NCFF is referenced under both SIGN-P4 and SIGN P5. ▪ Is that correct?
	Could Ms Wolfer's recommendation at her paragraph 9.5 be made as a Schedule 1 clause 16(2) alteration that is of minor effect?

[1] DPR-375.154 Waka Kotahi